

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 102(b)

Claims 1, 3-5 and 11 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Abe (US-5,713,756).

In addition, claims 1 and 8 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zander et al. (US-5,429,530).

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claims 2, 6, 7, 9 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Responsive to this, claim 2 is deleted, and claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1 and 2 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, by the amendments, it is believed that the rejections to claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) should be withdrawn, and the amended claim 1 should be allowable.

It is further submitted that the claims 3-15 should be allowable as they are dependent upon the amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Pao-Tien Hung

Applicant

Pao-Tien Hung

58, MA YUAN WEST ST.,

TAICHUNG, TAIWAN

Oct. 22, 2004